

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed 04/15/2008. Reconsideration in light of the amendments and remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

2. The Examiner objects to use of acronyms in the claims without first spelling out the acronyms, particularly embedded acronyms.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 3-6, 9, 13, 18-19, 24, 26-29, 32, 36, and 41-42 to spell out the acronyms. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims for the use of acronyms in the claims.

4. The Examiner further objects to the form of amended claims 1 and 24. The Examiner considers the preamble and one of the elements to be redundant.

Claim 1 cites in the preamble "...said link being within an LCN exhaustion state.." and element d) "an indication of the actual maximum capacity of said link and an advertised maximum capacity value set equal to zero." The Examiner understands the specification to indicate that element d) is the definition of a LCN exhaustion state [paragraph 0040].

Applicant respectfully submits that the specification actually indicates that element d) is the way that the inventive method advertises that the link is within an LCN exhaustion state. Thus the claim preamble is not redundant. What is claimed is a method that issues PTSE information that comprises element d) "an indication of the actual maximum capacity of said link and an advertised maximum capacity value set equal to zero" if "...said link being within an LCN exhaustion state..". Thus the preamble defines the conditions under which the claimed PTSE information is issued.

Claim 24 cites "..deciding when a link within an ATM PNNI network is within an LCN exhaustion state; " in one element and in sub-element d) is "an indication of the actual maximum capacity of said link and an advertised maximum capacity value set equal to zero".

As discussed above, these elements are not redundant because the first determines when the PTSE information claimed by the second element is issued.

The Examiner further notes that both claims 1 and 24 have two elements to describe a per priority level breakdown (elements a and c) and two elements to describe a per service category breakdown (elements b and e). The Examiner recommends combining the elements e.g. '..a per priority level breakdown of bandwidth reserved on said link and whether or not a connection exists on said link.'

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 24 as suggested by the Examiner and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to claims 1 and 24.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's allowance of claims 32-46.

Conclusion

Applicant reserves all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 05/21/2008

By /*James Henry*/

James Henry
Reg. No. 41,064
Tel.: (714) 557-3800 (Pacific Coast)